Haldane's Instanton in 2D Heisenberg model revisited: along the Avenue of Topology

Ying Jiang* and Guo-Hong Yang
Department of Physics, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, P.R. China and
Key Lab for Astrophysics, Shanghai 200234, P.R. China

Deconfined quantum phase transition from Néel phase to Valence bond crystal state in 2D Heisenberg model is under debate nowadays. One crucial issue is the suppression of Haldane's instanton on quantum critical point which drives the spinon deconfined. In this paper, by making use of the ϕ-mapping topological current theory, we reexamine the Haldane's instanton in an alternative way along the direction of topology. We find that the the monopole events are space-time singularities of Néel field $\vec{n}$, the corresponding topological charges are the wrapping number of $\vec{n}$ around the singularities which can be expressed in terms of the Hopf indices and Brouwer degrees of ϕ-mapping. The suppression of the monopole events can only be guaranteed when the ϕ-field possesses no zero points. Moreover, the quadrapolarity of monopole events in the Heisenberg model due to the Berry phase is also reproduced in this topological argument.

Keywords: Instanton, topological structure, quantum phase transition

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 03.75.Lm, 14.80.Hv

arXiv:0909.0396v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 2 Sep 2009

It is no doubt that Lev Landau was one of the most important physicist on the Planet. His work on order parameters[1], as pointed by Hagen Kleinert[2], was crucial for the development of the modern theory of phase transition. Indeed, associated by the powerful renormalization group theory, developed by Wilson, the Landau-Ginzburg-Wilson (LGW) theory[3] has become the guiding principle behind the modern theory of critical phenomena. Within this Landau's classic paradigm, the phase transitions are described by fluctuations of physical order parameters which reflect the symmetry breaking of the systems. This approach is also adapted to investigate quantum critical phenomena as well and provides the generally accepted framework for theoretical descriptions of quantum phase transition[4].

However, in recent years, several possible exceptions beyond the LGW paradigm, though under debate, have been discussed and have been attracting lot of effort[5].

As is known, over the last two decades, a large amount of work has been devoted to the study of low-dimensional quantum systems with frustrated magnetic interactions. These systems, due to the quantum fluctuations and reduced spatial dimensionality, have propensity to present variety of novel states, such as the absence of magnetic order even at zero temperature, the fractional elementary excitations, or the spontaneous dimerization of spins in the valence bond crystal ground states[6,7]. The question of spin-liquid states in two dimensions has been greatly motivated by the high-T_c superconductivity in the cuprates. Starting with Anderson's proposal of the resonating valence bond theory of superconductivity[8], a extensive amount of theoretical investigations are centered around the notion that the superconducting state in these materials is derived from a spin-liquid state by doping it with charge carriers. This idea continues to inspire the search for new quantum spin models with novel ground states on two-dimensional lattices and newer methods for studying these models.

In fact, prior to the motivations from the cuprates, low dimensional quantum spin models, in their own right, have been attracting many people and efforts for the reasons of explaining magnetic phenomena in real materials[9]. Purely theoretical motivations have led to interesting and important developments in this field[10,11,12,13]. Among them, a lot of attention has been focused particularly on the valence bond crystal (VBC) states, and more precisely on the transition between these states and a magnetically ordered phase[14,15,16]. In a VBC state, spins are coupled in pairs forming singlet states, these pairwise singlets are called valence bonds. These valence bonds themselves may be arranged in a periodic pattern which breaks the translation symmetry. Such states then define an order parameter quantifying the singlet long range order.

Since the ground state of the nearest neighbor Heisenberg antiferromagnet on square lattice has the Néel order[17], the VBC phase is expected to emerge only when the ordered state is sufficiently frustrated by adding suitable competing exchange interactions, i.e. the Hamiltonian under investigation takes the form of

$$H = J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \mathbf{S}_i \cdot \mathbf{S}_j + \cdots , \tag{1}$$

where $\langle\rangle$ denotes the neareast neighbor pair, and the ellipses stands for other competing interactions which leads to frustration and may be tuned to drive quantum phase transitions.

The question on the nature of quantum phase transition that separates the VBC state from a long-range ordered magnetic phase is very interesting and important since it is crucial for understanding the high-temperature superconductivity. In the Landau-Ginzburg approach, these two phases in the ground state are independently characterized by the nonzero values of the respective order parameters and the fluctuations thereof. Supposing a second order transition within the Landau-Ginsburg

paradigm[1], the order parameters of both phases should vanish precisely at the transition point. Intuitively, it seems more probable that, without fine-tune, the two order parameters will not vanish exactly at the same point, leading either to a first order transition, or to two second order transitions separated by an intermediate phase.

About five years ago, for a spin-1/2 system on square lattice, an alternative yet interesting scenario, in which an ordered AF phase undergoes a direct second order transition to VBC phase through a common quantum critical point, has been proposed by Senthil and coworkers[18]. As discussed above, this direct un-fine-tuned continuous transition between two-ordered phases, which break different symmetries, could not be described in the framework of Landau-Ginsburg theory[18,19]. Instead, in this scenario, however, such a quantum phase transition is described by means of fractional degrees of freedom, namely spinons. These spinons become deconfined at the quantum critical point from which AF and the VBC phases are claimed to emerge as the interaction parameters vary[20]. In this exotic scenario of quantum phase transition, an essential point is the behavior of Haldane's monopole events[21] in square lattice Heisenberg models. Senthil and coworkers argued that, due to the Berry phase, these monopole events (or namely, instantons) are suppressed exactly at quantum critical point, causing the spinons deconfined which in turn leads to a continuum quantum phase transition from long range order antiferromagnetic phase to a VBC state[18,19].

The key feature of this non-Landau critical behavior is that at the critical point the field theory in terms of fractionalized objects with no obvious physical probe is a more appropriate description. In spite of the difficulty of probing the fractionalized excitations, the fractionalized nature of the critical point leads to enormous anomalous dimension of the physical order parameter that is distinct from the Wilson-Fisher fixed-point or the mean-field result, which can be checked experimentally.

However, recent renormalization group argument shows that the above mentioned spinon deconfinement can only lead to a weak first order phase transition[22]. This viewpoint is supported by Monte Carlo numerical simulation[23]. In fact, doubts on the second order property of the deconfined quantum phase transition never stopped immediately after it being proposed[24,25,26].

But, due to the lack of exact results, this issue keeps to be controversial. For instance, recent numerical results suggest that this transition may exist in a SU(2) spin-1/2 model with both Heisenberg and ring exchange[27,28]. The direct quantum phase transition between collinear Néel phase and VBC states in two dimensional J_1-J_2 model has been observed numerically by the use of exact diagonalization[29]. The quantum phase transition beyond the Landau's paradigm in the spin-3/2 cold atom systems has also been investigated with the help of Sp(4) spin Heisenberg models on the triangular and square lattices[30].

Nevertheless, as pointed above, the crucial feature of the quantum phase transition between the magnetic ordered phase and VBS is the deconfinement of spinons which relies on the suppression of Haldane's monopole events at the quantum phase transition point. Hence, it is important to revisit the Haldane's monopole events from a more fundamental viewpoint, i.e. along the avenue of topology.

As is known, in the frame of field theory, the long-wavelength fluctuations around the direction of the Néel order parameter of the two-dimensional quantum Heisenberg spin system can be descriped by the $O(3)$ non-linear σ-model. By virtue of spin coherent state path integral, the corresponding action is expressed as

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{2}\int d\tau \int d^2r \left[\frac{1}{c^2}\left(\frac{\partial \vec{n}}{\partial \tau}\right)^2 + \left(\nabla_r \vec{n}\right)^2\right] + S_B, \quad (2)$$

where S_B is the so-called Berry phase[4] which strongly affects the behavior of the integer and half integer spin system[12,21]. The Berry phase is unimportant in the long-wave length properties of Néel state[31], while is very crucial in describing the quantum paramagnetic phase[15]. Thus, the $O(3)$ non-linear σ-model associated with the Berry phase is sufficient to be used to investigate the Néel state and VBC state.

As is known, a Néel configuration $\vec{n}(\vec{r})$ of the system can be characterized by the corresponding Pontryagin index

$$Q = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int d^2r \vec{n}\cdot\left(\partial_x \vec{n}\times\partial_y \vec{n}\right) \quad (3)$$

which can be written in a more symmetric way

$$Q = \frac{1}{8\pi}\int d^2r \epsilon^{0\mu\nu}\epsilon^{abc} n^a \partial_\mu n^b \partial_\nu n^c, \quad (4)$$

here a, b, c denote the indices in spin space, μ and ν stand for the lattice spacial indices while 0 for the time parameter τ. This quantity is interpreted as the total topological charge of a type of topological defects in this system, skyrmions. The topological charge totally reflects the topological structure of the Néel configuration of the non-linear σ-system.

The Pontryagin index is a topological invariant for a continuous manifold, in other words, in the $O(3)$ non-linear σ-model, providing that $\vec{n}(\vec{r})$ is always well defined in the whole space, it is easy to verify that the total topological charge doesn't change as the field evolves with time, i.e. the during any time interval, we have

$$\Delta_\tau Q = 0. \quad (5)$$

However, when we look back to our original system, we recognize that in the original Heisenberg model, spins sit only on lattice sites, when considering the long-wavelength fluctuations and taking continuum limit, singularities of configurations $\vec{n}(\vec{r})$ at places away from the lattice sites may be allowed, which will violate the topological charge conservation of skyrmions in the system, and the so-called monopole events or instantons emerge.

In order to investigate topological properties of the system properly in the framework of non-linear σ model, the singularities mentioned above should be taken into account, hence the condition of well defined $\vec{n}(\vec{r})$ is relaxed. In this case, generally, the Néel configuration $\vec{n}(\vec{r})$ would be expressed as the norm of a specific underlying field $\vec{\phi}(\vec{r})$,

$$n^a = \frac{\phi^a}{\|\phi\|}. \tag{6}$$

In this way, the singularities have been properly encrypted in, and the singular points of $\vec{n}$ field correspond to zero points of $\vec{\phi}$ field. Then, the topological charge density of skyrmions in Eq. (4) is rewritten in terms of $\vec{\phi}$ as

$$q = \frac{1}{8\pi}\epsilon^{0\mu\nu}\epsilon^{abc}n^a\partial_\mu n^b\partial_\nu n^c = \frac{1}{8\pi}\epsilon^{0\mu\nu}\epsilon^{abc}\frac{\phi^a}{\|\phi\|^3}\partial_\mu\phi^b\partial_\nu\phi^c. \tag{7}$$

By making use of the topological current method[32,33,34] and Laplacian Green function relation, straightforward calculation shows that

$$\partial_\tau q = D\left(\frac{\phi}{z}\right)\delta\left(\vec{\phi}\right), \tag{8}$$

where $D(\phi/z)$ is the Jacobian of the ϕ-mapping, here z denotes (x, y, τ). The equation Eq. (8) clearly shows that, when $\vec{\phi}$ field possesses no zero point, i.e. when $\vec{n}$ is well defined in the whole space-time, the change rate of the skyrmion charge is zero, as what we expect; while when $\vec{\phi}$ field does possess zero point, the change rate of the skyrmion charge is no longer zero, it entirely depends on the mapping properties of the $\vec{\phi}$-field at the zero point, in other words, depends on the topological property of the $\vec{\phi}$-field. These singularities of $\vec{n}$ are just the so-called monopole events or instantons. This clearly shows that the conservation of skyrmions thence the deconfinement of spinons are closely related to the absence of zero points of $\vec{\phi}$ field.

To determine the relation between the change rate of the skyrmion number and the topological index of the ϕ-mapping is definitely an interesting and constructive topic. Actually, the change rate of the skyrmion number is just the space-time charge density of corresponding monopole events. In order to investigate the change rate of the skyrmion number, let us suppose that the i-th instanton emerges at the space-time point $z_i = (\tau_i, x_i, y_i)$, i.e. at these points, $\vec{\phi}(z_i) = 0$, then the δ-function $\delta\left(\vec{\phi}\right)$ can be decomposed as

$$\delta\left(\vec{\phi}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} c_i\delta(z - z_i), \quad c_i = \frac{\beta_i}{\left|D\left(\frac{\phi}{z}\right)_{z_i}\right|} \tag{9}$$

where β_i is the Hopf index of the ϕ-mapping around the zero point z_i. When substituting this relation into Eq. (8), we find that

$$\partial_\tau q = \sum_i \beta_i\eta_i\delta(z - z_i), \tag{10}$$

where $\eta_i = \text{sign}\left[D\left(\frac{\phi}{z}\right)_{z_i}\right]$ is the so-called the Brouwer degree of the ϕ-mapping around this zero point. $\beta_i\eta_i$ is interpreted as the topological charge of the i-th monopole event located at space-time point z_i. Hence, we can easily get that, in any finite time interval, the total change of the skyrmion number is the sum of topological charges of all monopole events emerging in that time interval, i.e.

$$\Delta Q = \int d\tau \int d^2r\ \partial_\tau q = \sum_i \beta_i\eta_i. \tag{11}$$

In fact, this is just the wrapping number of $\vec{n}$, due to the second homotopy[35] of sphere $\pi_2\left(S^2\right) = Z$, it is integer. The above equation shows that Q is nonconserved, and monopole events (or instantons) appear to change the skyrmion number Q by integer value.

Now let us concentrate on the influence of the Berry phase to the behavior of the spin system with integer and half-integer spins. The Berry phase has the relation with $\vec{n}$ through Q_{xt}, which is analogous to the skyrmion number Q but in the two-dimensional x-t space-time[21], as is shown

$$S_B = 2\pi S\sum_n (-1)^n Q_{xt}(y_n). \tag{12}$$

When taking continuum limit, we can immediately get

$$S_B = \frac{2\pi S}{2}\Delta Q. \tag{13}$$

Associated with the single-valuedness of wavefunction of the system, i.e., the Berry phase should be integer multiple of 2π to ensure the absence of destructive interference of monopole events, this expression indicates clearly that for spin 1/2 system,

$$\Delta Q = 4m, \quad m \in Z, \tag{14}$$

i.e. the monopole events, when exist, should be quadrapoled.

The above simple argument shows a good agreement with Haldane's result on square lattice Heisenberg model[21] and other previous subtle analysis[14,15] , but from a different point of view. Moreover, as pointed out by Senthil and his collaborators[18], the compactness of the system is violated by the destructive interference between the Berry phase and monopole events, leading the skyrmion number asymptotically conserved exactly on the quantum critical point, and the quantum phase transition between Néel state and VBS state occurs mediated by the deconfinement of the emergent spinon degree of freedom. This scenario reflects the non-compactness of the system at the QCP. From our calculation, this is due

to the absence of zero points of $\vec{\phi}$ field. To determine the condition under which the zero points of $\vec{\phi}$ field are suppressed may provide an alternative possibility to look insight into the intrinsic properties of the deconfinement quantum critical phenomena.

Acknowledgement

Work supported by Shanghai Leading Academic Discipline Project(project Number: S30105), and by NSFC under Grant No. 10845002. Financial support from the Science & Technology Committee of Shanghai Municipality under Grant Nos. 08dj1400202, 09PJ1404700 (Y.J.) and 08JC14097 (G.-H.Y) is also acknowledged.

* Electronic address: yjiang@shu.edu.cn

[1] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz, and E. M. Pitaevskii, *Statistical Physics* (Butterworth-Heinemann, New York, 1999)
[2] H. Kleinert, *From Landau's order parameters to modern disorder field,* in *Lev Davidovich Landau and his impact on contemporary theoretical physics* (*Horizons in World Physics, Volume 264*), edited by Ammar Sakaji (Nova Science Publisher, 2009)
[3] K.G. Wilson and J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. **12** (1974) 75-199
[4] For a review, see S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, (Cambridge, New York, 1999)
[5] For a more recent review, see S. Sachdev, Nat. Phys. **4** (2008) 173-185
[6] G. Misguich and C. Lhuillier, *Two-dimensional quantum antiferromagnets*, in *Frustrated spin systems*, edited by H.T. Diep (World Scientific, Singapore, 2005) pp. 229-306
[7] I. Bose, in *Field Theories in Condensed Matter Physics*, edited by S. Rao (Hindustan, New Delhi, 2000) pp. 359-408
[8] P.W. Anderson, Science **235** (1987) 1196-1198
[9] R. Kumar and B. Kumar, arXiv: 0803.3306 (2008), and the references therein
[10] E.H. Lieb, T.D. Schultz, and D.C. Mattis, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **16** (1961) 407-466
[11] I.A. Affleck and E.H. Lieb, Lett. Math. Phys. **12** (1986) 57-69
[12] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50** (1983) 1153-1156
[13] M.B. Hastings, Phys. Rev. B **69** (2004) 104431
[14] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Nucl. Phys. B **316** (1989) 609-640
[15] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 1694-1697; Phys. Rev. B **42** (1990) 4568-4589
[16] F. Nogueira, Phys. Rev. B **77** (2008) 195101
[17] E. Manousakis, Rev. Mod. Phys. **63** (1991) 1-62
[18] T. Senthil, A. Vishwanath, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, and M.P.A. Fisher, Science **303** (2004) 1490-1494
[19] T. Senthil, L. Balents, S. Sachdev, A. Vishwanath, and M.P.A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B**70** (2004) 144407
[20] M. Levin and T. Senthil, Phys. Rev. B **70** (2004) 220403(R)
[21] F.D.M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61** (1988) 1029-1032
[22] F.S. Nogueira, S. Kragset, and A. Sudbø, Phys. Rev. B **76** (2007) 220403(R)
[23] A.B. Kuklov, M. Matsumoto, N.V. Prokof'ev, B.V. Svistunov, and M. Troyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008) 050405
[24] A. Kuklov, N. Prokof'ev, and B. Svistunov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 230402
[25] J. Sirker, W.H. Zheng, O.P. Sushkov, and J. Oitmaa, Phys. Rev. B**73** (2006) 184420
[26] F. Krüger and S. Scheidl, Europhys. Lett. **74** (2006) 896-902
[27] A. W. Sandvik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 227202
[28] R.G. Melko and R.K. Kaul, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 017203
[29] A. Gellé, A. Läuchli, B. Kumar, and F. Mila, Phys. Rev. B **77** (2008) 014419
[30] Y. Qi and C. Xu, Phys. Rev. B**78** (2008) 014410
[31] S. Chakravarty, B. I. Halperin, D. R. Nelson, Phys. Rev. B **39** (1989) 2344-2371
[32] Y. Jiang, Phys. Rev. B**70** (2004) 012501
[33] Y. Jiang and Y.S. Duan, Jour. Math. Phys. **41** (2000) 2616-2628; *ibid* 6463-6476
[34] Y.S. Duan, Y. Jiang, and T. Xu, Phys. Lett. A **252** (1999) 307-315
[35] A. Hatcher, *Algebraic topology* (Cambridge University Press, 2002)